C00015352

0

Memorandum for file OSI-N/A

21 January 1953

Meeting of OSI Advisory Group on UFO January=14-thru-17,-1953------

Declassified by 057375 date 20 APR is/1

At 0945 on January 14, 1953, an ad hoc panel of scientific consultants was conveued to review the "Unidentified Flying Cojects" problem. A detailed statement of the problem presented to the group by CIA is attached as Appendix. A. The panel consisted of the following:

Dr. Robertson, CIT Dr. Luis-Alvarez Dr. S. Gondsnit, Brookhaven Dr. Thornton Page, ORJ Johns Hopkins Dr. J.A. Hynek, consultant to ATIC.

The following members of the staff of OSI were present for various parts of the discussions.

| Dr. | H.M. | Chadwell |
|-----|------|---|
| | | Clark |
| • | P.G. | Strong |
| Lt. | Col. | Durant III Oder (P&E) Stovenson=(Weapons) |

To assist the scientific panel in its review and analysis of evidence; Capt. E. J. Appelt of ATIC, Lt. Neashan and Mr. H. Noo of the Navy photo interpretation lab at Anacostisg and Major Fournet and Capt. Smith of Air Force Directorate of Intelligence were present.

A final report on the results of the relating is being prepared for the AD/SI by (F.C. Durant but it is believed that the following is a fair statement of the conclusions reached:

1. No evidence is available to indicate any physical threat to the security of the United States.

2. No evidence is available to indicate the existence or use of any as yet unknown (to us) fundamental scientific principles.

3. The subject "UFO" is not of direct intelligence interest. It is of indirect intelligence interest only insofar as any knowledge about the inumerable unsolved mysteries of the universe are of intelligence interest.

4. The subject "UFO" is of operational interest for three reasons: (a) Interference with air defense by intentional energy jarming or

- by lack of ability on the part of operating porsonnel to discriminate between radar enoralies and actual aircorne weapons
 (b) Related to (a), interference with air defense ty overloading communication lines from the air defense observation stations.
 - (c) Fossibility of a psychological offensive by the energy tired with respect to an actual attac could conceivably periously

Approved for Release

> Dr. Pobertson, .CIT Dr. Luiz-Alvarez Dr. S. Gondsmit, Brookhavon Dr. Thornton Page, OR) Johns Hopkins Dr. J.A. Hynek, consultant to ATIC.

The following members of the staff of OSI were present for various parts of the discussions.

Dr. H.M. Chadwell R.L. Clark P.G. Strong F.C. Durant III Lt. Col. Oder (P&E) D.B. Stevenson (Weapons)

To assist the scientific ranel in its review and enalysis of evidence; Capt. E. J. Auppelt of ATIC, Lt. Neashan and Mr. H. Noo of the Navy photo interpretation lab at Anacostian and Major Fournet and Capt. Smith of Air Force Directorate of Intelligence were present.

A final report on the results of the meeting is being prepared for the AD/SI by [3.C. Durant but it is believed that the following is a fair statement of the conclusions reached:

1. No evilence is available to indicate any physical threat to the security of the United States.

2. No evidence is available to indicate the existence or use of any as yet unknown (to us) fundamental scientific principles.

3. The subject "UFO" is not of direct intelligence interest. It is of indirect intelligence interest only insofar as any knowledge about the invaerable unsolved mysteries of the universe are of intelligence interest.

4. The subject "UFO" is of operational interest for three reasons: --

- (a) Interference with air defense by intentional energy jarring or by lack of ability on the part of operating personnel to digoriminate between radar anomalies and actual airborne weapons
- (b) Related to (a), interference with air defense by overloading communication lines from the air defense observation stations.
- (c) Possibility of a psychological offensive by the enery timed with respect to an actual attac: could conceivably seriously

KOULTIN

C00015352

reduce the defense effort of the general public.

It is noted that these general conclusions as stated here do not specifically answer the needs presented in Appendix A. However, it is anticipated that comment on these points will be presented in a written statement from the scientific panel to AD/SI.

DBS:gl) (typed 12 February 1953)

· · · ·